



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/508,496	03/08/2000	MASAAKI YAMAMOTO	9683/65	9755
757	7590	10/03/2003	EXAMINER	
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE P.O. BOX 10395 CHICAGO, IL 60611			CHENCINSKI, SIEGFRIED E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3628	

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/508,496	YAMAMOTO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Siegfried E. Chencinski	3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-63 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-63 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 12.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION*****Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**1. Claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 11-13, 18-22, 24-32, 34-38, 40-47, 49-55, 57, 58, 61 & 63**  
are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lazaridis (US Patent 6,463,464).

**Re. Claims 1 & 11,** Lazaridis anticipates a communication network comprising an information provider server, a plurality of user terminals, and a transfer device for routing information transmission between said information provider server and said user terminals; a push-type information transmission method comprising:

- registering a user terminal with the information provider server (Col. 7, line 38 – Col. 8, line 5, particularly Col. 7, line 49);
- receiving, at the transfer device, information for the user terminal from said information provider server (Col. 3, line 9);
- storing, at the transfer device, said information (Col. 3, lines 12-13);
- calling the user terminal (Col. 4, lines 5-9), and
- transmitting from the transfer device the stored information in response to a request from said called user terminal (Col. 7, line 38 – Col. 8, line 5; particularly Col. 7, line 49).

**Re. Claim 2,** Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 1, wherein registering said user terminal with the information provider server comprises pre-accessing said server device and registering a network address of the user terminal with said information provider server as a registration procedure for receiving an information transmission service offered by said information provider server, and wherein said information provider server provides information to user terminals which have completed said registration (Col. 7, line 31 – Col. 8, line 2).

**Re. Claims 3 & 12,** Lazaridis anticipates a communication network comprising an information provider server, a plurality of user terminals, and a transfer device for routing information transmission between said information provider server and said user terminals, a push-type information transmission method performed by said transfer device comprising:

- storing identification information relating to user terminals which are to receive an information providing service offered by said information provider server (Col. 3, lines 12-13);
- modifying the identification information relating to the user terminals (Col. 3, lines 39-41);
- sending the modified identification information to the information provider server (Col. 9, lines 41-47);
- receiving information for transmission and a user terminal identifier from said information provider server (Col. 3, line 9);
- storing said information for transmission (Col. 4, lines 36-38);
- calling a relevant user terminal based on the stored identification information relating to user terminals, the modified identification information, and the user terminal identifier (Col. 4, lines 5-9); and
- transmitting the stored information for transmission in response to a request from the called user terminal (Col. 2, lines 17-23, Col. 3, lines 14-17).

Art Unit: 3628

**Re. Claims 5,** Lazaridis anticipates a communication network comprising an information provider server, a plurality of user terminals, and a transfer device for routing information transmission between said information provider server and said user terminals,

a push-type information transmission method performed by said transfer device comprising:

- storing user attribute data of users and network addresses of the user terminals in correspondence (Col. 3, lines 42-45);
- receiving information supplied from said information provider server together with attribute information of users designated as desired destinations (Col. 3, line 9);
- storing said received information (Col. 4, lines 36-38);
- comparing said stored user attribute data and the designated user attribute data, and specifying network addresses of user terminals corresponding to users having the designated attributes (Col. 3, line 42 – Col. 4, line 4);
- calling the specified user terminals (Col. 4, lines 5-9); and
- sending the stored information mail in response to requests from said called user terminals (Col. 2, lines 54-58; Col. 3, lines 14-17).

**Re. Claims 6,** Lazaridis discloses a push-type information transmission method as in claim 5, wherein said user terminal comprises a step of

- pre-accessing said information provider server and registering an address with said information provider server as a registration procedure for receiving an information transmission service offered by said information provider server (Col. 7, line 38 – Col. 8, line 5, particularly Col. 7, line 49), and
- said transfer device calls user terminals which have completed said registration (Col. 4, lines 5-9).

**Re. Claims 13,** Lazaridis anticipates a transfer device for routing information transmissions between an information provider server and a plurality of user terminals for receiving the information provided by said information provider server, comprising:

Art Unit: 3628

- memory for recording user attribute information and a network address of the user terminal in correspondence with each other with respect to users (Col. 3, line 12);
- receiving means for receiving from said information provider server information supplied together with attribute information of users designated as a desired destinations (Col. 3, line 9);
- storage means for storing the received information (Col. 1, line 59; the storage of e-mails at a mailbox address is inherent to e-mail systems);
- specifying means for comparing the recorded user attribute information with the designated user attribute information, and specifying network addresses of user terminals which correspond to user having the designated attributes (Col. 3, line 42 – Col. 4, line 4);
- calling means for calling the specified user terminals (Col. 4, lines 5-9); and
- sending means for sending said stored information in response to requests from the called user terminals (Col. 9, lines 41-47).

**Re. Claims 18,** Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 1, wherein registering the user terminal with the information provider server comprises registering by the transfer device an address of the user terminal (Col. 7, lines 45-52).

**Re. Claims 19,** Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 18, further comprising:

- registering a network address of the user terminal with the transfer device (Col. 7, lines 45-52);
- storing in a database of the transfer device the network address of the user terminal and a user management number (Storing – Col. 7, line 44),
- the user management number being correlated to the network address of the user terminal (User management number - Col. 9, line 46; the Command Message from the User – Col. 7, lines 40-42; Re. Correlating – The correlating function is an inherent and essential underlying programmed activity throughout

the operation of Lazarides' "redirection" method and system (e.g. Col. 12, line 1 – Col. 14, line 30); and

- wherein registering by the transfer device an address of the user terminal comprises registering the user management number (Registering - Col. 7, line 49).

**Re. Claims 20,** Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 19,

- wherein receiving information for the user terminal comprises receiving information and the user management number (Col. 7, line 7 – Col. 8, line 5);
- further comprising determining the network address for the user terminal by searching the database with the user management number to determine the correlated network address (Col. 3, lines 44-45; 49-60); and
- wherein calling the user terminal comprises calling the user terminal at the correlated work address (Col. 4, lines 5-9).

**Re. Claims 21,** Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 1,

- wherein receiving information for the user terminal further comprises receiving a mailbox address (Col. 3, lines 9, 15; a mailbox address is inherent to e-mail); and
- wherein storing said information comprises storing said information at the mailbox address in the transfer device (Col. 1, line 59; the storage of e-mails at a mailbox address is inherent to e-mail systems).

**Re. Claims 22,** Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 2,

- wherein receiving information for the user terminal comprises receiving information and the network address (Col. 4, lines 36-38; Col. 9, lines 41-47);
- wherein the request from said called user terminal comprises a telephone number of the user terminal (Col. 3, line 60; Col. 8, lines 3-4);

Art Unit: 3628

- further comprising comparing the telephone number in the request with the network address (supra); and
- wherein transmitting the stored information comprises transmitting the stored information if at least a part of network address matches the telephone number in the request (Col. 3, line 1).

**Re. Claims 24**, Lazaridis anticipates a communication network comprising a plurality of information provider servers, a plurality of user terminals, and a transfer device for routing information transmission between said information provider servers and said user terminals, a push-type information transmission method performed by said transfer device comprising:

- receiving, from an information provider server, push-type information for transmitting to at least one user terminal (Col. 7, lines 38-42);
- determining whether the information provider server is registered with the transfer device (Col. 7, lines 45-52); and
- rejecting the push-type information if the information provider is not registered with the transfer device (Col. 8, lines 6-37).

**Re. Claims 25**, Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 24, wherein rejecting the push-type information comprises disposing of the push-type information (Col. 8, lines 29-30).

**Re. Claims 26**, Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 24, wherein the transfer device receives a network address of the information provider server; and wherein determining whether the information provider server is registered with the transfer device comprises comparing the network address of the information provider server with a list of network addresses of registered information provider servers (Col. 8, lines 10 -14).

Art Unit: 3628

**Re. Claims 27,** Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 26, further comprising registering, by the information provider server, the network address for the information provider server in the list of network addresses, wherein registering is performed prior to receiving the push-type information (Col. 7, lines 38 – Col. 8, line 5).

**Re. Claims 28,** Lazaridis discloses a push-type information transmission method as in claim 26, further comprising storing the push-type information if the information provider server is registered (Col. 7, lines 43-44; Col. 9, lines 53-56).

**Re. Claims 28,** Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 26, further comprising determining at least one user terminal to transmit the push-type information if the information provider server is registered with the transfer device (Col. 7, line 53 – Col. 8, line 5).

**Re. Claims 30,** Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 29, further comprising:  
calling the user terminal (Col. 11, lines 38-40);  
receiving a request from the user terminal to send the information; and sending the information to the user terminal after receiving the request (Col. 8, lines 39-47).

**Re. Claims 31,** Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 24, wherein receiving push-type information further comprises receiving information for identifying at least one user terminal (Col. 7, line 53 – Col. 8, line 5).

**Re. Claims 32,** Lazaridis discloses a push-type information transmission method as in claim 31, further comprising registering the user terminals; and wherein determining at least one user terminal is based on the information for identifying at least one user terminal and the registration of the user terminals (Col. 7, line 7 – Col. 8, line 5).

Art Unit: 3628

**Re. Claims 34,** Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 32,

- wherein registering the user terminals comprises registering attributes of users of the user terminals (Col. 9, lines 41-58);
- wherein the information for identifying at least one terminal comprises attribute information of users designated as desired destinations (Col. 9, lines 48-58); and
- wherein determining at least one terminal comprises comparing the registered attributes of users with the designated user attribute information, and specifying user terminals which correspond to users having the designated attributes (Col. 12, line 1 – Col. 14, line 30; Col. 9, line 46).

**Re. Claims 35,** Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 34,

- wherein registering the user terminals further comprises registering telephone numbers of the user terminals, a telephone number of a specific user terminal being correlated to attributes of a user of the specific user terminal (Col. 7, line 64 – Col. 8, line 5); and
- wherein specifying user terminals comprises specifying telephone numbers of user terminals which correspond to users having the designated attributes (Col. 7, line 64 – Col. 8, line 5).

**Re. Claims 36,** Lazaridis anticipates a communication network comprising a plurality of information provider servers, a plurality of user terminals, and a transfer device for routing information transmission between said information provider servers and said user terminals, a push-type information transmission method comprising:

- registering the user terminals with the transfer device and the information provider server (Col. 7, lines 38-52);
- registering the information provider servers with the transfer device (Col. 7, lines 38-52);

Art Unit: 3628

- receiving push-type information at the transfer device from an information provider server (Col. 8, lines 10 -14); and
- determining, by the transfer device, which user terminals to send the push-type information based on the registration of the user terminals and the information provider servers (Col. 7, line 53 – Col. 8, line 5).

**Re. Claims 37,** Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 36, wherein determining which user terminals to send the push-type information comprises determining whether the information provider, from which the push-type information is received, is registered with the transfer device (Col. 7, lines 45-52).

**Re. Claims 38,** Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 37, wherein determining which user terminals to send the push-type information further comprises determining that no user terminals are sent the push-type information if the information provider server is not registered with the transfer device (Col. 8, lines 6-37).

**Re. Claims 40,** Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 36,

- wherein registering the user terminals comprises registering attributes of users of the user terminals (Col. 7, lines 38-52; col. 9, lines 41-58);
- wherein receiving push-type information further comprises receiving attribute information of users designated as desired destinations (Col. 9, lines 41-58); and
- wherein determining which user terminals to send the push-type information comprises comparing the registered attributes of users with the designated user attribute information, and specifying user terminals which correspond to users having the designated attributes (Col. 7, line 38 – Col. 8, line 5; Col. 9, line 27 – Col. 10, line 4).

**Re. Claims 41,** Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 36,

- o further comprising calling the determined user terminals (Col. 11, lines 38-40); and
- o transmitting from the transfer device the push-type information in response to requests from said called user terminals (Col. 8, lines 39-47).

**Re. Claims 42,** Lazaridis anticipates a communication network comprising an information provider server, a plurality of user terminals, and a transfer device for routing information transmission between said information provider server and said user terminals, a push-type information transmission method performed by said transfer device comprising:

- o storing user terminal information (Col. 7, lines 53-58);
- o receiving, from the information provider server, transmitted information and a user terminal identifier for identifying at least one of the user terminals, wherein the user terminal identifier is other than a network address of a user terminal (Col. 10, lines 9-14);
- o storing the transmitted information (Col. 10, line 61 – Col. 11, lines 2-3, partic. line 2);
- o determining at least one user terminal to send the transmitted information based on the user terminal identifier and the user terminal information (Col. 12, lines 1-16); and
- o sending the transmitted information to the determined user terminal (Col. 12, lines 56-64).

**Re. Claims 43,** Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 42, further comprising:

- o calling the user terminal to request whether to transfer the information (Col. 35-40); and

Art Unit: 3628

- receiving a request from the user terminal to transfer the information (Col. 11, lines 38-40),
- wherein sending the transmitted information comprises sending the transmitted information in response to the request from the called user terminal (Col. 11, lines 35-40).

**Re. Claims 44,** Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 42, wherein storing user terminal information comprises registering the user terminals with the transfer device (Col. 9, lines 41-47).

**Re. Claims 45,** Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 44, wherein registering the user terminals comprises storing, for a specific user terminal, attributes of a user of the specific user terminal and a network address of the specific user terminal with the transfer device (Col. 9, lines 41-47).

**Re. Claims 46,** Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 42, further comprising registering the user terminals with the information provider server (Col. 9, lines 41-47).

**Re. Claims 47,** Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 46, wherein registering the user terminals with the information provider server comprises: receiving from the user terminal a network address of the user terminal; creating the user terminal identifier based on the network address; and sending the user terminal identifier to the information provider server (Col. 9, lines 41-58).

**Re. Claims 49,** Lazaridis anticipates a push-type information transmission method as in claim 42,

- wherein the stored user terminal information comprises stored attribute data for users of the user terminals (Col. 3, line 1);

Art Unit: 3628

- wherein the user terminal identifier comprises designated attributes (Col. 9, lines 41-58); and
- wherein determining at least one user terminal comprises:
  - comparing the designated attributes with stored attribute data (supra); and
  - specifying network addresses of user terminals corresponding to users having the designated attributes (Col. 12, line 1 – Col. 14, line 30; Col. 9, line 46).

**Re. Claims 50,** Lazaridis anticipates a transfer device for routing information transmission from an information provider server to a plurality of user terminals, the transfer device comprising programming code in said transfer device for:

- receiving, from an information provider server, push-type information for transmitting to at least one user terminal (Col. 4, lines 36-38; Col. 9, lines 41-47);
- determining whether the information provider server is registered with the transfer device (Col. 3, lines 44-45; 49-60); and
- rejecting the push-type information if the information provider is not registered with the transfer device (Col. 8, lines 6-37).

**Re. Claims 51,** Lazaridis discloses a transfer device of claim 50, wherein the programming code for rejecting the push-type information comprises programming code for disposing of the push-type information (the programming code is inherent).

**Re. Claims 52,** Lazaridis anticipates a transfer device of claim 50,

- wherein the transfer device receives a network address of the information provider server (Col. 8, lines 10 -14); and
- wherein the programming code for determining whether the information provider server is registered with the transfer device comprises programming code for comparing the network address of the information provider server with a list of network addresses of registered information provider servers (the programming code is inherent).

Art Unit: 3628

**Re. Claims 53,** Lazaridis anticipates a transfer device of claim 52, further comprising programming code for registering, by the information provider server, the network address for the information provider server in the list of network addresses (the programming code is inherent).

**Re. Claims 54,** Lazaridis anticipates a transfer device of claim 52, further comprising programming code for storing the push-type information if the information provider server is registered (the programming code is inherent).

**Re. Claims 55,** Lazaridis anticipates a transfer device for routing information from an information provider server to a plurality of user terminals, the transfer device comprising:

- o a database (Col. 7, line 44);
- o an information managing portion for storing registration information from the user terminals and the information provider server in the database (Col. 7, line 44), and
- o for determining which user terminal to transmit information to based on the stored registration information from the user terminals and the information provider server (Col. 3, lines 44-45; 49-60);
- o an electronic mail managing portion comprising at least one mailbox for storing the information to be transmitted (inherent to electronic mailboxes); and
- o a bus for connecting the information managing portion and the electronic mail managing portion (a bus an inherent hardware component of the computers in question).

**Re. Claims 57,** Lazaridis anticipates a transfer device of claim 55,

- o wherein the registration information for the user terminals stored in the database comprises attributes of users of the user terminals (Col. 9, lines 41-58); and
- o wherein the information managing portion receives designated attributes from the information provider server and determines user terminals which have attributes

in the database that match the designated attributes (Col. 8, lines 10 –14; Col. 9, lines 41-58).

**Re. Claims 58,** Lazaridis anticipates a transfer device of claim 55, further comprising a system control portion for performing protocol conversion between a mobile packet communication network for the user terminals and an Internet for the information provider server (the system control is an inherent component of the system in question).

**Re. Claims 61,** Lazaridis anticipates an information provider server in an Internet sending information to a plurality of user terminals in a mobile telephone network via a transfer device, the information provider server comprising:

- identifying means for identifying a set of attributes with respect to users of the user terminals for purposes of providing information services (Col. 7, line 53 – Col. 8, line 5); and
- providing means for providing information to the user terminals by forwarding to the transfer device the information with the identified set of attributes so that the transfer device specifies addresses of the user terminals corresponding to users having the identified set of attributes (the providing means is an inherent component of the system in question).

**Re. Claims 63,** Lazaridis anticipates a mobile terminal device for receiving information from an information provider server via a transfer device, the mobile terminal device comprising:

- requesting means for requesting registration of the user terminal at the transfer device (Col. 7, line 7 – Col. 8, line 5),
- the registration at the transfer device comprising registering attributes of a user of the user terminal and a telephone number of the user terminal (Col. 7, line 7 – Col. 8, line 5); and
- receiving means for receiving information (Col. 7, line 7 – Col. 8, line 5),

Art Unit: 3628

- the information provider server sending the information and designated attributes to the transfer device (Col. 9, lines 41-58),
- the transfer device sending the information to the receiving means if the designated attributes match at least some of the registered attributes (Col. 8, lines 39-47).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**2. Claims 4, 7, 8 & 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazaridis as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Haff (US Patent 6,442,571).**

**Re. Claim 4,** Lazaridis discloses a push-type information transmission method, further comprising

- registering a network addresses of the user terminals with the transfer device (),
- wherein storing identification information comprises storing the network addresses of the user terminal (Col. 3, lines 42-45); and
- wherein sending the modified identification information to the information provider server comprises sending the user management numbers to the information provider server (Col. 9, lines 41-58).

Lazaridis does not explicitly disclose a push-type information transmission method wherein modifying the identification information comprises assigning user management numbers to the network addresses. However, Takahashi discloses a management number scheme for keeping track of a plurality of items of a similar kind (Col. 23, lines 33-34). Management numbers are generic identification numbers (i.e. ID) which have been a ubiquitous device used throughout the millennia to keep track of things and to also provide simple protection for the identity of something. It would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of applicant's invention to

Art Unit: 3628

have combined the art of Lazaridis with the ubiquitous practice disclosed by Takahashi for the purpose of providing some protection for user telephone numbers while also obtaining the efficiencies of a management numbering or ID system.

**Re. Claim 7, Lazaridis and Takahashi** disclose a push-type information transmission method and related device in a communication network with certain limitations, as described above.

Lazaridis and Takahashi do not explicitly disclose a push-type information transmission method as in any one of claims 3 and 4 above wherein said information provider server belongs to a first communication network which follows a first communication protocol, said plurality of user terminals belong to a second communication network which follows a second communication protocol different from said first communication protocol; and said transfer device is a gateway for converting between said first and second communication protocols and routing the exchange of said information. However, Haff discloses a push-type information transmission method as in any one of claims 1-6, wherein said server device belongs to a first communication network which follows a first communication protocol, said plurality of user terminals belong to a second communication network which follows a second communication protocol different from said first communication protocol; and said transfer device is a gateway for converting between said first and second communication protocols and routing the exchange of said information mail (Col. 7, line 66 - Col. 8, line 7). Hence, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to make use of the teachings of Lazaridis, Takahashi and Haff to implement an efficient, automated, user controlled push type system of information mail to selectively provide information with the above described protocols through a routing device to users according to users' predetermined menus and preapproval of each information transmission upon being notified through a call that the information transmission is available.

**Re. Claim 8, neither Lazaridis nor Takahashi explicitly** disclose a push-type information transmission method and related device as in claims 7 and 14, wherein said plurality of user terminals are given first network addresses used only on said first communication network and are discriminated on said first communication network by second network addresses which have a one-to-one correspondence with said first network addresses in said second communication network; and said transfer device converts between said second network addresses in said first communication network and said first network addresses in said second communication network. However, **Haff** discloses a push-type information transmission method and related device as in claims 7 and 14, wherein said plurality of user terminals are given first network addresses used only on said first communication network and are discriminated on said first communication network by second network addresses which have a one-to-one correspondence with said first network addresses in said second communication network; and said transfer device converts between said second network addresses in said first communication network and said first network addresses in said second communication network (Col. 3, line 66 - Col. 8, line 7). Hence, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to make use of

Art Unit: 3628

the teachings of Lazaridis, Takahashi and Huff to implement an efficient, automated method wherein said plurality of user terminals are given first network addresses used only on said first communication network and are discriminated on said first communication network by second network addresses which have a one-to-one correspondence with said first network addresses in said second communication network; and said transfer device converts between said second network addresses in said first communication network and said first network addresses in said second communication network.

**Re. Claims 9, neither Lazaridis nor Takahashi explicitly disclose a push-type information transmission method and related device as in claims 8 and 15, wherein said second communication network is a local network accommodating specific user terminals; and said first communication network is a global network device to which are allotted identification information for identifying an absolute address in the network. Haff discloses a push-type information transmission method and related device as in claims 8 and 15, wherein said second communication network is a local network accommodating specific user terminals; and said first communication network is a global network device to which are allotted identification information for identifying an absolute address in the network (Col. 6, lines 3-11). Hence, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to make use of the teachings of Lazaridis, Takahashi and Haff to implement an efficient, automated method wherein said second communication network is a local network accommodating specific user terminals; and said first communication network is a global network device to which are allotted identification information for identifying an absolute address in the network.**

3. **Claims 7-10 and 14-17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazaridis as applied to claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 11, 12 & 13 above, and further in view of Haff.

**Re. Claim 7, Lazaridis discloses a push-type information transmission method and related device in a communication network with certain limitations, as described above.**

Lazaridis does not explicitly disclose a push-type information transmission method wherein said information provider server belongs to a first communication network which follows a first communication protocol, said plurality of user terminals belong to a second communication network which follows a second communication protocol different from said first communication protocol; and said transfer device is a gateway for converting between said first and second communication protocols and routing the exchange of said information. However, Haff discloses a push-type information transmission method, wherein said server device belongs to a first communication network which follows a first communication protocol, said plurality of user terminals belong to a second communication network which follows a second communication protocol different from said first communication protocol; and said transfer device is a gateway for converting between said first and second

Art Unit: 3628

communication protocols and routing the exchange of said information mail (Col. 7, line 66 - Col. 8, line 7). Hence, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to make use of the teachings of Lazaridis and Haff to implement an efficient, automated, user controlled push type system of information mail to selectively provide information with the above described protocols through a routing device to users according to users' predetermined menus and preapproval of each information transmission upon being notified through a call that the information transmission is available.

Re. **Claims 8 & 15**, Lazaridis does not explicitly disclose a push-type information transmission method and related device as in claims 7 and 14, wherein said plurality of user terminals are given first network addresses used only on said first communication network and are discriminated on said first communication network by second network addresses which have a one-to-one correspondence with said first network addresses in said second communication network; and said transfer device converts between said second network addresses in said first communication network and said first network addresses in said second communication network. Haff discloses a push-type information transmission method and related device as in claims 7 and 14, wherein said plurality of user terminals are given first network addresses used only on said first communication network and are discriminated on said first communication network by second network addresses which have a one-to-one correspondence with said first network addresses in said second communication network; and said transfer device converts between said second network addresses in said first communication network and said first network addresses in said second communication network (Col. 3, line 66 - Col. 8, line 7). Hence, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to make use of the teachings of Lazaridis and Haff to implement an efficient, automated, user controlled push type system of information mail wherein said plurality of user terminals are given first network addresses used only on said first communication network and are discriminated on said first communication network by second network addresses which have a one-to-one correspondence with said first network addresses in said second communication network; and said transfer device converts between said second network addresses in said first communication network and said first network addresses in said second communication network.

Re. **Claims 9 & 16**, Lazaridis does not explicitly disclose a push-type information transmission method and related device as in claims 8 and 15, wherein said second communication network is a local network accommodating specific user terminals; and said first communication network is a global network device to which are allotted identification information for identifying an absolute address in the network. Haff discloses a push-type information transmission method and related device as in claims 8 and 15, wherein said second communication network is a local network accommodating specific user terminals; and said first communication network is a global network device to which are allotted identification information for identifying an absolute address in the network (Col. 6, lines 3-11). Hence, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to make use of the

Art Unit: 3628

teachings of Lazaridis and Haff to implement an efficient, automated, user controlled push type system of information mail wherein said second communication network is a local network accommodating specific user terminals; and said first communication network is a global network device to which are allotted identification information for identifying an absolute address in the network.

**Re. Claims 10 & 17,** Lazaridis does not explicitly disclose a push-type information transmission method and related device as in claims 9 and 16 wherein said second communication network is a mobile communication network accommodating a plurality of user terminals which are mobile stations; and said first communication network is the Internet. Haff discloses a push-type information transmission method and related device as in claims 9 and 16, wherein said second communication network is a mobile communication network accommodating a plurality of user terminals which are mobile stations; and said first communication network is the Internet (Col. 21, lines 22-27). Hence, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to make use of the teachings of Lazaridis and Haff to implement an efficient, automated, user controlled push type system of information mail wherein said second communication network is a mobile communication network accommodating a plurality of user terminals which are mobile stations; and said first communication network is the Internet.

**Re. Claim 14,** Lazaridis does not explicitly disclose a push-type information transmission method and related device as in claims 11-13 wherein said information provider server belongs to a first communication network which follows a first communication protocol, and said plurality of user terminals belong to a second communication network which follows a second communication protocol different from that of said first communication network; and further comprising protocol converter for converting between said first and second protocols. Haff discloses a transfer device as in any one of claims 11-13, wherein said information provider server belongs to a first communication network which follows a first communication protocol, and said plurality of user terminals belong to a second communication network which follows a second communication protocol different from that of said first communication network; and further comprising protocol converter for converting between said first and second

protocols (Col. 3, line 66 - Col. 8, line 7). Hence, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to make use of the teachings of Lazaridis and Haff to implement an efficient, automated, user controlled push type system of information mail wherein said information provider server belongs to a first communication network which follows a first communication protocol, and said plurality of user terminals belong to a second communication network which follows a second communication protocol different from that of said first communication network; and further comprising protocol converter for converting between said first and second protocols.

4. **Claim 23** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazaridis as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Takahashi (US Patent 6,260,027).

**Re. Claim 23**, Lazaridis discloses a push-type information transmission method as in claim 19,

- wherein the request from said called user terminal comprises a telephone number of the user terminal (supra);
- further comprising comparing the telephone number in the request with a telephone number correlated to the user information received from the information provider (Col. 12, line1 – Col. 14, line 30; comparing is an inherently underlying feature of the Lazaridis disclosure. ); and
- wherein transmitting the stored information comprises transmitting the stored information if at least a part of telephone number correlated to the user management number received from the information provider matches the telephone number in the request (Col. 3, line 1; Col. 9, line 65).

Lazaridis does not explicitly disclose the use of a management number.

(Applicant defines the “user management number” as “user identity information having a one-to-one correspondence with the telephone number in the user information managing portion U-MAX” and that the “user management number is used to avoid the telephone number from being sent outside the packet communication network

Art Unit: 3628

MPN" (Amended Specification, Page 19, lines 7-11). However, Takahashi discloses the use of a management number (Col. 23, line 33). Also, a user management number in applicant's context is merely an application of a ubiquitous identification numbering system in use for millennia. Hence, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to make use of the teachings of Lazaridis, Takahashi and the experience of millennia to implement an efficient, automated, user controlled push type system of information mail making use of user management numbering system for efficiency and to protect the user's telephone number.

5. **Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazaridis as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Takahashi.**

Re. Claim 33, Lazaridis discloses a push-type information transmission method as in claim 32,

- wherein the information for identifying at least one terminal comprises a user management number (Col. 7, lines 49-52);
- wherein registering the user terminals comprises registering a network addresses of the user terminals (Col. 7, line 17); and
- wherein determining at least one user terminal comprises selecting a network address from a list of registered addresses based on the user management number (Col. 7, lines 31-34, 41; Col. 8, lines 6-17; Col. 9, lines 56-66).

Lazaridis does not explicitly disclose the use of a management number. However, Takahashi discloses the use of a management number (Col. 23, line 33). Also, a user management number in applicant's context is merely an application of a ubiquitous identification numbering system in use for millennia. Hence, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to make use of the teachings of Lazaridis, Takahashi and the experience of millennia to implement an efficient, automated, user controlled push type system of information mail making use of user management numbering system for efficiency and to protect the user's telephone number.

Art Unit: 3628

6. **Claim 39** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazaridis as applied to claim 36 above, and further in view of Takahashi.

Re. Claim 39, Lazaridis discloses a push-type information transmission method as in claim 36,

- wherein registering the user terminals comprises registering network addresses of the user terminals (Col. 7, lines 38-52);
- wherein receiving push-type information further comprises receiving at least one user management number, the user management number for designating at least one user terminal and is other than the registered network addresses of the user terminals (Col. 9, lines 26-42);
- wherein determining which user terminals to send the push-type information comprises selecting a network address from a list of registered addresses based on the user management number (Col. 9, lines 41 – Col. 10, line 4).

Lazaridis does not explicitly disclose the use of a management number. However, Takahashi discloses the use of a management number (Col. 23, line 33). Also, a user management number in applicant's context is merely an application of a ubiquitous identification numbering system in use for millennia. Hence, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to make use of the teachings of Lazaridis, Takahashi and the experience of millennia to implement an efficient, automated, user controlled push type system of information mail making use of user management numbering system for efficiency and to protect the user's telephone number.

7. **Claim 48** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazaridis as applied to claim 42 above, and further in view of Takahashi.

Re. Claim 48, Lazaridis does not explicitly disclose a push-type information transmission method as in claim 47, wherein the user terminal identifier is a user management number; and wherein creating the user terminal identifier based on the network address comprises selecting the user management number; and creating a one-to-one correspondence between the user management number and the network

Art Unit: 3628

address for the user terminal. However, Takahashi discloses the use of a management number (Col. 23, line 33). Also, a user management number in applicant's context is merely an application of a ubiquitous identification numbering system in use for millennia. Hence, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to make use of the teachings of Lazaridis, Takahashi and the experience of millennia to implement an efficient, automated, user controlled push type system of information mail making use of user management numbering system for wherein the user terminal identifier is a user management number; and wherein creating the user terminal identifier based on the network address comprises selecting the user management number; and creating a one-to-one correspondence between the user management number and the network address for the user terminal for efficiency and to protect the user's telephone number.

8. **Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazaridis as applied to claim 55 above, and further in view of Takahashi.**

Re. Claim 56, Lazaridis discloses a transfer device of claim 55,

- wherein the registration information for the user terminals stored in the database comprises telephone numbers of the user terminals (Col. 3, line 60; Col. 8, lines 3-4).

Lazaridis does not explicitly disclose the use of a management number, including the details of the information managing portion receiving the user management numbers from the information provider server and converting the user management numbers into telephone numbers based on the database. However, Takahashi discloses the use of a management number (Col. 23, line 33). Also, a user management number in applicant's context is merely an application of a ubiquitous identification numbering system in use for millennia. Converting the management numbers into the data the represent is inherent to their use. Hence, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to make use of the teachings of Lazaridis, Takahashi and the experience of millennia to implement an efficient,

automated, user controlled push type system of information mail making use of user management numbering system for efficiency and to protect the user's telephone number.

**9. Claim 59 & 60 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazaridis in view of Takahashi.

**Re. Claim 59,** Lazaridis discloses an information provider server in an Internet sending information to a plurality of user terminals in a mobile telephone network via a transfer device, the information provider server comprising:

- registration means for registering user management numbers of the user terminals with the information provider server (Col. 7, line 7 – Col. 8, line 5),
- providing means for providing information services to the user terminals in response to requests from registered user terminals (Col. 7, lines 45-52).

Lazaridis does not explicitly disclose the use of a management numbers and their one-to-one correspondence with telephone numbers of the user terminals. However, Takahashi discloses the use of a management number (Col. 23, line 33). Also, a user management number in applicant's context is merely an application of a ubiquitous identification numbering system in use for millennia. Further, the one-to-one correspondence with user telephone numbers is an inherent aspect of using the management numbers, since that is really their primary purpose. Hence, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to make use of the teachings of Lazaridis, Takahashi and the experience of millennia to implement an efficient, automated, user controlled push type system of information mail making use of user management numbering system for efficiency and to protect the user's telephone number.

**Re. Claim 60,** Lazaridis discloses an information provider server of claim 59, wherein the registration means comprises receiving means for receiving the user management numbers from the transfer device (Col. 3, line 9).

Art Unit: 3628

Lazaridis does not explicitly disclose the use of a management number. However, Takahashi discloses the use of a management number (Col. 23, line 33). Also, a user management number in applicant's context is merely an application of a ubiquitous identification numbering system in use for millennia. Hence, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to make use of the teachings of Lazaridis, Takahashi and the experience of millennia to implement an efficient, automated, user controlled push type system of information mail making use of user management numbering system for efficiency and to protect the user's telephone number.

**10. Claim 62 is rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazaridis in view of Takahashi.

**Re. Claim 62,** Lazaridis discloses a mobile terminal device for receiving information from an information provider server via a transfer device, the mobile terminal device comprising:

- requesting means for requesting registration of the user terminal at the transfer device and the information provider device (Col. 7, line 7 – Col. 8, line 5),
- the registration at the transfer device comprising registering a telephone number of the user terminal (Col. 7, lines 45-52), and
- receiving means for receiving information (Col. 7, line 7 – Col. 8, line 5),
- the information provider server sending the information (Col. 3, line 9), and
- sending the information to the receiving means (Col. 8, lines 39-47).

Lazaridis does not explicitly disclose the use of a management number. However, Takahashi discloses the use of a management number (Col. 23, line 33). Also, a user management number in applicant's context is merely an application of a ubiquitous identification numbering system in use for millennia. Hence, it would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of the invention to make use of the teachings of Lazaridis, Takahashi and the experience of millennia to

Art Unit: 3628

implement an efficient, automated, user controlled push type system of information mail making use of user management numbering system for efficiency and to protect the user's telephone number.

### ***Response to Arguments***

**11.** Applicant's arguments filed July 7, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

**A. REFERENCES IN THEIR ENTIRETY:** Applicant is reminded that the entire content of a reference applies as the reference, not just the cited portions. The Examiner offers the following detail as an accommodation to the Applicant.

**B. NO SUGGESTION TO COMBINE:** In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation to combine is clear for an ordinary practitioner of the art to have made at the time of Applicant's invention. The practitioner's motivation is to bring to market the most efficient push-type information transmission method and transfer device therefor with the greatest possible amount of features in order to have the most saleable product possible for the purpose of obtaining the greatest possible financial rewards from the invention.

**C. FEATURES NOT CLAIMED:** In response to applicant's numerous arguments that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the majority of features upon which applicant relies from page 19, line 9 through page 24, line 1, are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The Examiner addresses below those arguments which do deal with features which are recited in the claims on a specific, point by point basis.

**D. ARGUMENTS AGAINST REJECTIONS OF CLAIMED FEATURES:**

**Re. Claims 1 & 11:**

a) Applicant asserts that (1) the Lazaridis reference "does not teach registering the mobile computer 24 with the computer 26 which sends the e-mail. (2) Further, the transmission of the e-mail to the mobile computer 24 does not depend on a download request by the mobile computer 24. Rather, the host device 10 sends the e-mail whether or not the mobile computer 24 sends a request". (page 21, lines 3-6).

**Reply:**

(1) Lazaridis does disclose "registering a user terminal with the information provider server" (Currently Amended Claim 1, element (a)). (Lazarides, Col. 7, line 38 – Col. 8, line 5; particularly Col. 7, line 49). Applicant's argument is in fact not according to the current wording of the claim. However, for Applicant's information, Lazarides' disclosure includes mobile communications devices, including certain attachments, such as word processing or voice (Col. 7, lines 64-67).

Art Unit: 3628

(2) Lazarides does disclose the option of programming the redirection of an e-mail in the manner or at the timing elected by the user, OR as actually claimed "transmitting from the transfer device the stored information in response to a request from said called user terminal (Col. 7, line 53 – Col. 9, line 48, especially Col. 8, lines 12-13 and Col. 11, lines 35-40; Col. 13, lines 15-17). In actual fact, Lazarides goes to great lengths to illustrate a large variety of controls the user, both desk top and mobile, can exercise for receiving redirected e-mail, including the options claimed by Applicant.

b) "The Rossman and Huff references fail to remedy the deficiency of the Lazaridis reference since both do not teach or suggest sending the push-type information after a request from a user terminal to download". (page 21, lines 7-9).

**Reply:**

This argument is moot since Lazarides does in fact disclose the disputed information.

**Re. Claims 3 & 12:**

**a) Applicant asserts that**

(1) "... the **Lazaridis** reference does not teach or suggest claim element (f): "transmitting the stored information for transmission in response to a request from the called user terminal." (2) "Further, while the **Lazaridis** reference does store the address of the mobile computer 24, it does not modify the address and does not send the modified address to the computer 26. Instead, the address is merely stored with host device 10. When a computer 26 sends an e-mail to the host device, it merely includes the address of the host device. The computer does not include the

address of the mobile computer 24 (or a modified address of the mobile computer 24). Rather, the host device repackages the e-mail, appends the address of the mobile computer 24 stored in its memory, and sends the communication to the mobile computer 24." (page 22, lines 2-11).

**Reply:**

- (1) As noted in the Examiner's response to the arguments re. claims 1&11 above, Lazarides does disclose "transmitting the stored information for transmission in response to a request from the called user terminal." ("transmission to the user's mobile device - Col. 9, line 1; Response to a request .... - *supra*).
- (2) Applicant's argument for claims 3&12, a) (2) is moot because this argument does not pertain to Applicant's claims and related limitations in claims 3 & 12, as amended.

**b) Applicant asserts that**

"The **Roszman** reference likewise fails to teach or suggest any of the above recited limitations. .... **Roszman** fails to teach or suggest registering with an information provider server using modified identification information for a user terminal." (Page 22, lines 12-15).

**Reply:**

Applicant's argument is moot since Lazarides does disclose the failings asserted by Applicant (*Supra*).

Art Unit: 3628

**Re. Claims 5 & 13:**

**a) Applicant asserts:**

(1) Re. claim element (f), "the **Lazaridis** reference does not teach or suggest "transmitting the stored information for transmission in response to a request from the called user terminal"". (page 23, lines 19-21).

(2) Re. claim element (a), "the host device 10 in the **Lazaridis** reference .... does not store any "user attribute data" of the user of the mobile terminal". (page 23, lines 22-23).

(3) Re. claim element (b), "the **Lazaridis** reference does not push any "attribute information of users designated as desired destinations"". (page 23, lines 23-24)

(4) Re. claim element (d), "Finally, the host device 10 does not compare ``said stored user attribute data and the designated user attribute data" or specify "network addresses of user terminals corresponding to users having the designated attributes"". (Page 23, lines 19-29).

**Reply:**

(1) Re. claim element (f), Lazarides does in fact, per the actual claim limitation (f), "send the stored information mail in response to requests from said called user terminals" (supra).

(2) Re. claim element (a), Lazarides does in fact disclose the storing of "user attribute data" of the user of the mobile terminal (Storing – Col. 8, line 6; Col. 9, lines 41-42, 53-56; Storing of User Attribute Data – Col. 9, lines 41- 58).

(3) Re. claim element (b), Lazarides does in fact push "attribute information of users designated as desired destinations" (Col. 9, lines 48-58).

(4) Re. claim element (d), the host device does compare "said stored user attribute data and the designated user attribute data" (This comparing function is implied as an essential underlying programmed activity throughout the operation of Lazarides' "redirection" method and system e.g. Col. 12, line1 – Col. 14, line 30. It would have been obvious to an ordinary practitioner of the art at the time of applicant's invention to have understood that the method and system disclosed by

Lazarides uses underlying comparing techniques throughout in order to accomplish, among many other things, the comparing of stored user attribute data and the designated user attribute data.

Also, Lazarides does specify "network addresses of user terminals corresponding to users having the designated attributes" (Col. 9, line 46).

b) Applicant asserts that "The **Rossmann** reference likewise fails to teach or suggest any of the above recited limitations. **Rossmann** does not teach or suggest storing user attributes of the user terminal, sending designated attributes from the information provider server, or selecting user terminals which have attributes that match the designated attributes from the information provider server". (Page 23, line 30 – page 24, line 1).

**Reply:**

These arguments are moot in view of the fact that Lazarides does disclose these disputed features of Applicant's claims 5 & 13.

***Conclusion***

**12. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Siegfried Chencinski whose telephone number is 703-305-6199. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday, gam to 6pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Hyung S. Sough, can be reached on 703-308-0505.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

*Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington D. C. 20231*

or faxed to:

(703)305-7687 [Official communications; including  
After Final communications labeled  
"Box AF"]

(703) 746-8177 [Informal/Draft communications, labeled  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, 7<sup>th</sup> floor receptionist.

SEC

September 22, 2003

*Sough*  
HYUNG SOUGH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600